

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

STATUS OF THE APPLICATION

Claims 1, 2, 4-21, and 23-41 were pending in this application and examined. Claims 1, 20, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen (US Patent 6,339,437). Claims 11-13, 17-18, 30-32, and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Rowe et al. (US Patent 5,737,599; "Rowe"). Claims 2, 5, 21, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Gounares et al. (US Patent 6,681,370; "Gounares"). Claims 4 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of MSDN Online web Workshop (published online on April 20, 2000; "MSDN Workshop"). Claims 6-8 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Okamoto et al. (US Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0065814; "Okamoto"). Claims 9-10 and 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen in view of Schultz (US Patent 5,721,902). Claims 14-15 and 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe et al. in view of Nielsen. Claims 16 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe et al. in view of Okamoto et al. and further in view of Nielsen. Claims 19, 38, and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rowe et al. in view of Nielsen.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 11, 12, 14, 16-20, 30, 31, 33, and 35-41. Applicant submits that support for the claims can be found in the specification and the figures and now new subject matter has been introduced by the amendments. Claims 1, 2, 4-21, and 23-41 remain pending in this application after filing of this amendment.

Examiner Interview

Applicant would like to thank Examiner Joshua Campbell for the interview related to this application conducted on November 9, 2004. Applicant has amended the claims per discussions with the Examiner during the interview. A "Substance of the Interview" is also being filed with this amendment.

THE CLAIMS

Claim 1

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen. Applicant has amended claim 1 as discussed with the Examiner to clearly distinguish claim 1 from Nielsen and the other cited prior art. As recited in amended claim 1, a set of text patterns is determined for the set of concepts wherein a plurality of text patterns is determined for at least one concept in the set of concepts. The document is then searched to identify occurrences of the set of text patterns in the document and the occurrences are annotated.

The concept of determining text patterns for concepts, wherein multiple text patterns are determined for one or more concepts, and then using those text patterns to search the document provides several advantages over the prior art in which the text patterns to be searched have to be explicitly specified by the user. A user of the invention recited in claim 1 has to only identify a set of concepts that are of interest to the user. The invention recited in claim 1 automatically determines the text patterns for the concepts and uses the text patterns to search the document. In this manner, the user does not have to explicitly specify (or even know) all the actual text patterns that are used to search the document. The invention claimed in claim 1 thus saves the user from the hassles of having to specify all the text patterns to be searched--the task of searching a document is thus simplified for the user.

As discussed with the Examiner during the interview, Applicant submits that above-described concept is not taught or suggested by Nielsen or the other cited references. In Nielsen, the terms to be searched have to be explicitly identified in the information retrieval query. Occurrences of only the explicitly specified terms are marked in the document (See Nielsen: col. 1 lines 17-22, lines 37-40; col. 4 lines 56-61; Figs. 2A and 2B). The user has to thus explicitly specify the terms to be searched. Unlike, claim 1, Nielsen does not teach determining of text patterns for a set of concepts, wherein a plurality of text patterns is determined for at least one concept in the set of concepts. The claimed feature of determining multiple text patterns for a concept and then using the text patterns to search the document is not taught or suggested by Nielsen.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, is not anticipated by Nielsen. Further Applicant believes that the other references cited by the Examiner also fail to disclose such as concept. Applicant thus submits that claim 1 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 2 and 4-10

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2 and 4-10 which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1, should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 1, and others. Further, the dependent claims recite additional features which make the claims patentable for additional reasons.

Claim 11

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Rowe. Applicant has amended claim 11 as discussed with the Examiner to clearly distinguish the claim 11 from Rowe and the other cited prior art.

Claim 11, as amended, recites that the single thumbnail image is dynamically changed to reflect a change in the display of the document in the first viewing area. For example, if the style associated with a concept is changed (e.g., from bolded text to underlined text), then this causes the display of text entities related to the concept to change from being bolded to being underlined in the document displayed in the first viewing area. The single thumbnail image is also dynamically changed to reflect this change--the display of text entities related to the concept is changed in the thumbnail from bolded to underlined.

Applicant submits that the concept of dynamically changing the thumbnail is not taught or suggested by Rowe or the other cited references. In Rowe, the document is displayed using Acrobat Reader or Acrobat Exchange, available from Adobe Systems (See Rowe: col. 11 lines 59-63). As indicated in Applicant's specification (See Specification: pg. 29 lines 7-10), Adobe's Acrobat related products provide a "static" thumbnail—i.e., the thumbnail cannot dynamically change. Consequently, Applicant submits that Rowe fails to teach or suggest a thumbnail that changes dynamically in response a change to the display of the document.

Applicant thus submits that claim 11, as amended, is not anticipated by Rowe. Further, Applicant believes that the other references cited by the Examiner also fail to disclose such as concept. Applicant thus submits that claim 11 is in a condition for allowance.

Claims 12-18

Applicant submits that dependent claims 12-18 which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 11, should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 11, and others. Further, the dependent claims recite additional features which make the claims patentable for additional reasons.

Claims 19, 38, and 41

Applicant submits that claims 19, 38, and 41 should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 1, and others. The claims also recite additional features that make the claims patentable for additional reasons.

Claims 20, 21, 23-29, and 39

Applicant submits that independent claims 20 and 39 should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 1, and others. Further, Applicant submits that dependent claims 21 and 23-29 which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 20, should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 20, and others. Further, the dependent claims recite additional features which make the claims patentable for additional reasons.

Claim 30-37 and 40

Applicant submits that independent claims 30 and 40 should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 11, and others. Further, Applicant submits that dependent claims 31-37 which depend either directly or indirectly from claim 30, should be allowed for at least a similar rationale as discussed for allowing claim 30, and others.

Appl. No. 09/636,039
Amdt. dated December 10, 2004
Reply to Final Office Action of September 17, 2004

PATENT

Further, the dependent claims recite additional features which make the claims patentable for additional reasons.

Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

An IDS is being filed along with this amendment. The Examiner is respectfully requested to expressly consider the cited references during the prosecution of the present application.

An IDS was also filed for this application on July 15, 2004. This IDS draws the Examiner's attention to U.S. Application No. 09/661,184 filed September 13, 2000 (Atty Docket No. 15358-004250US) which issued as U.S. Patent No. 6,457,026. This IDS also draws the Examiner's attention to U.S. Application No. 10/214,380 filed August 6, 2002 (Atty Docket No. 15358-004251US) which is co-pending with the present application.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

S. B. Kotwal

Sujit B. Kotwal
Reg. No. 43,336

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 650-326-2422
SBK:km
60354690 v1